arXiv:1007.4980v1 [math.FA] 28 Jul 2010

# Sharp weak type inequalites for the dyadic maximal operator

Eleftherios N. Nikolidakis

**Abstract**

We obtain sharp estimates for the localized distribution function of $\mathcal{M}\phi$, when $\phi$ belongs to $L^{p,\infty}$ where $\mathcal{M}$ is the dyadic maximal operator. We obtain these estimates given the $L^1$ and $L^q$ norm, $q < p$ and certain weak $L^p$-conditions.

*Keywords*: Dyadic, Maximal

## 1. Introduction

The dyadic maximal operator on $\mathbb{R}^n$ is a useful tool in analysis and is defined by:

$$\mathcal{M}_d\phi(x) = \sup\left\{\frac{1}{|Q|}\int_Q |\phi(u)|du : x \in Q,\ Q \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n \ \text{ dyadic cube}\right\} \tag{1.1}$$

for every $\phi \in L^1_{loc}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ where $|\cdot|$ is the Lebesgue measure on $\mathbb{R}^n$ and the dyadic cubes are those formed by the grids $2^{-N}\mathbb{Z}^n$ for $N = 1, 2, \dots$ .

As it is well known it satisfies the following weak type (1,1) inequality

$$|\{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : \mathcal{M}_d\phi(x) \geq \lambda\}| \leq \frac{1}{\lambda}\int_{\{\mathcal{M}_d\phi \geq \lambda\}} |\phi(u)|du \tag{1.2}$$

for every $\phi \in L^1(\mathbb{R}^n)$ and every $\lambda > 0$ from which it is easy to get the following $L^p$ inequality:

$$\|\mathcal{M}_d\phi\|_p \leq \frac{p}{p-1}\|\phi\|_p. \tag{1.3}$$

For every $p > 1$ and $\phi \in L^p(\mathbb{R}^n)$ it is easy to see that the weak type inequality (1.2) is best possible and it is proved in [9] that (1.3) is also best possible (for general martingales see [2] and [3].

In studying the dyadic maximal operator it would be convenient to work with functions supported in the unit cube $[0,1]^n$ and more generally defined on a non-atomic probability measure space $(X, \mu)$ where the dyadic sets are given in a family $\mathcal{T}$ of measurable subsets of $X$ that has a tree-like structure similar to the one in the dyadic case. Then we replace $\mathcal{M}_d$ by

$$\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{T}}\phi(x) = \sup\left\{\frac{1}{\mu(I)}\int_I |\phi|d\mu : x \in I \subseteq X,\ I \in \mathcal{T}\right\} \tag{1.4}$$

and (1.2) and (1.3) remain true and sharp is this setting.

Actually, in this general setting (1.3) has been improved even more by inserting the $L^1$-norm of $\phi$ as a variable giving the so called Bellman functions of the dyadic maximal operator. In fact in [5] the following function of variables $f, F$ has been explicitly computed

$$B(f,F) = \sup\left\{\int_X (\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{T}}\phi)^p d\mu : \phi \geq 0,\ \int_X \phi d\mu = f,\ \int_X \phi^p d\mu = F\right\} \tag{1.5}$$

where $0 < f^p \leq F$.

The related Bellman functions for the case $p < 1$ have been also computed in [6].

It is interesting now to search what happens in case we replace the $L^p$-norm with the quasi norm $\|\cdot\|_{p.\infty}$ defined in $L^{p,\infty}$, where

$$\|\phi\|_{p,\infty} = \sup\{\lambda\mu(\{\phi \geq \lambda\})^{1/p} : \lambda > 0\} \tag{1.6}$$

for every $\phi$ such that this supremum is finite.

It is known that $L^{p,\infty} \supsetneqq L^p$ and $\mathcal{M}$ can be defined on $L^{p,\infty}$ with values on $L^{p,\infty}$. As a matter of fact it is not difficult to see that $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{T}}$ satisfies the following

$$\|\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{T}}\phi\|_{p,\infty} \leq \frac{p}{p-1}\|\phi\|_{p,\infty} \tag{1.7}$$

for every $\phi \in L^{p,\infty}$.

In [8] it is proved that (1.7) is best possible.

Actually, a stronger fact is proved there, namely that

$$\sup\left\{\|\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{T}}\phi\|_{p,\infty} : \phi \geq 0, \int_X \phi d\mu = f,\ \|\phi\|_{p,\infty} = F\right\} = \frac{p}{p-1}F \tag{1.8}$$

for every $(f, F)$ such that $0 < f \leq \frac{p}{p-1}F$. That is (1.7) is sharp allowing every value for the $L^1$-norm of $\phi$.

In the present paper we compute

$$\sup\left\{\mu((\{\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{T}}\phi \geq \lambda\})) : \phi \geq 0,\ \int_X \phi d\mu = f,\ \int_X \phi^q d\mu = A,\ \|\phi\|_{p,\infty} = F\right\}. \tag{1.9}$$

for a fixed $q$ such that $1 < q < p$, and for all allowable values of $(f, A, F)$.

Actually doing this we improve (1.2) even more by inserting as variables the $L^q$-norm and the $L^{p,\infty}$-quasi norm of $\phi$. From this we have as a consequence that

$$\sup\left\{\|\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{T}}\phi\|_{p,\infty} : \phi \geq 0,\ \int_X \phi d\mu = f,\ \int_X \phi^q d\mu = A, \|\phi\|_{p,\infty} = F\right\} = \frac{p}{p-1}F, \tag{1.10}$$

that is (1.7) is best possible allowing every possible value of the $L^1$ and $L^q$-norm.

At last we mention that all the above calculations are independent of the measure space and the associated tree. We begin now with:

## 2. Preliminaries

Let $(X, \mu)$ be a non-atomic probability space.

The following holds:

**Lemma 2.1** *Let* $\phi : X \to \mathbb{R}^+$ *be measurable and* $I \subseteq X$ *be measurable with* $\mu(I) > 0$. *Suppose that* $\frac{1}{\mu(I)} \int\limits_I \phi d\mu = s$. *Then for every* $t$ *such that* $0 < t \leq \mu(I)$ *there exists a measurable set* $E_t \subseteq I$ *with* $\mu(E_t) = t$ *and* $\frac{1}{\mu(E_t)} \int\limits_{E_t} \phi d\mu = s$.

**Proof.** Consider the measure space $(I, \mu/I)$ and let $\psi : I \to \mathbb{R}^+$ be the restriction of $\phi$ on $I$ that is $\psi = \phi/I$. Then if $\psi^* : [0, \mu(I)] \to \mathbb{R}^+$ is the decreasing rearrangement of $\psi$, we have that

$$\frac{1}{t}\int_0^t \psi^*(u)du \geq \frac{1}{\mu(I)}\int_0^{\mu(I)} \psi^*(u)du = s \geq \frac{1}{t}\int_{\mu(I)-t}^{\mu(I)} \psi^*(u)du. \tag{2.1}$$

Since $\psi^*$ is decreasing we get the inequalities in (2.1), while the equality is obvious since

$$\int_0^{\mu(I)} \psi^*(u)du = \int_I \phi d\mu.$$

From (2.1) it is easily seen that there exists $r \geq 0$ such that $t + r \leq \mu(I)$ with

$$\frac{1}{t}\int_r^{t+r} \psi^*(u)du = s. \tag{2.2}$$

It is also easily seen that there exists $E_t$ measurable subset of $I$ such that

$$\mu(E_t) = t \text{ and } \int_{E_t} \phi d\mu = \int_r^{t+r} \psi^*(u)du \tag{2.3}$$

since $(X, \mu)$ is non-atomic.

From (2.2) and (2.3) we get the conclusion of the lemma. $\square$

We now call two measurable subsets of $X$ almost disjoint if $\mu(A \cap B) = 0$.

We give now the following

**Definition 2.1** *A set $\mathcal{T}$ of measurable subsets of $X$ will be called a tree if the following conditions are satisfied.*

*(i)* $X \in \mathcal{T}$ *and for every* $I \in \mathcal{T}$ *we have that* $\mu(I) > 0$.

*(ii) For every* $I \in \mathcal{T}$ *there corresponds a finite or countable subset* $C(I) \subseteq \mathcal{T}$ *containing at least two elements such that:*

  *(a) the elements of* $C(I)$ *are pairwise almost disjoint subsets of* $I$.

  *(b)* $I = \cup C(I)$.

*(iii)* $\mathcal{T} = \bigcup\limits_{m \geq 0} \mathcal{T}_{(m)}$ *where* $\mathcal{T}_0 = \{X\}$ *and*

$$\mathcal{T}_{(m+1)} = \bigcup_{I \in \mathcal{T}_{(m)}} C(I).$$

*(iv)* $\lim\limits_{m \to +\infty} \sup\limits_{I \in \mathcal{T}_{(m)}} \mu(I) = 0.$ $\square$

From [5] we have the following

**Lemma 2.2** *For every* $I \in \mathcal{T}$ *and every* $\alpha$ *such that* $0 < \alpha < 1$ *there exists subfamily* $\mathcal{F}(I) \subseteq Y$ *consisting of pairwise almost disjoint subsets of* $I$ *such that*

$$\mu\Bigg( \bigcup_{J \in \mathcal{F}(I)} J \Bigg) = \sum_{J \in \mathcal{F}(I)} \mu(J) = (1 - \alpha)\mu(I). \quad \square$$

Let now $(X, \mu)$ be a non-atomic probability measure space and $\mathcal{T}$ a tree as in Definition 1.1. We define the associated maximal operator to the tree $\mathcal{T}$ as follows: For every $\phi \in L^1(X, \mu)$ and $x \in X$, then

$$\mathcal{M}\phi(x) = \mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{T}}\phi(x) = \sup \left\{ \frac{1}{\mu(I)} \int_I |\phi| d\mu : \; x \in I \in \mathcal{T} \right\}.$$

# 3. Domain of the extremal problem

Our aim is to find for every $\lambda > 0$ the following

$$B(f,A,\lambda) = \sup\left\{\mu(\{\mathcal{M}\phi \geq \lambda\}) : \phi \geq 0,\ \int_X \phi d\mu = f,\ \int_X \phi^q d\mu = A,\right.$$
$$\left. \|\phi\|_{p,\infty} = \frac{p-1}{p}\right\}. \tag{3.1}$$

For this reason we define

$$B_1(f,A,\lambda) = \sup\left\{\mu(\{\mathcal{M}\phi \geq \lambda\}) : \phi \geq 0,\ \int_X \phi^q d\mu = A,\right.$$
$$\left. \|\phi\|_{p,\infty} \leq \frac{p-1}{p}\right\}. \tag{3.2}$$

In order to find (3.1) and (3.2) it is necessary to find the allowable values of $f$ and $A$. That is the values for which there exists $\phi : (X,\mu) \to \mathbb{R}^+$ such that

$$\int_X \phi d\mu = f,\ \int_X \phi^q d\mu = A \ \text{ and } \ \|\phi\|_{p,\infty} = \frac{p-1}{p} \ \text{ or } \ \|\phi\|_{p,\infty} \leq \frac{p-1}{p}.$$

For the beginning let $f, A$ and $\phi$ such that

$$\int_X \phi d\mu = f,\ \int_X \phi^q d\mu = A,\ \ \|\phi\|_{p,\infty} \leq \frac{p-1}{p}.$$

Consider the decreasing rearrangement of $\phi$, $g = \phi^* : [0,1] \to \mathbb{R}^+$. Then for every $\lambda > 0 |\{g \geq \lambda\}| = \mu(\{\phi \geq \lambda\})$ where $|\cdot|$ the Lebesgue measure on $[0,1]$. As a consequence

$$\int_0^1 g = f,\ \ \int_0^1 g^q = A \tag{3.3}$$

and

$$\sup\{\lambda|\{g \geq \lambda\}|^{1/p} : \lambda > 0\} \leq \frac{p-1}{p} \tag{3.4}$$

(3.4) now gives for every $\lambda > 0$ that

$$|\{g \geq \lambda\}| \leq \left[\frac{p - 1/p}{\lambda}\right]^p. \tag{3.5}$$

But if $\psi : (0,1] \to \mathbb{R}^+$ defined by $\psi(t) = (1-p)t^{-1/p}$, then (3.5) means that

$$g(t) \leq \psi(t) \ \text{ for every } \ t \in (0,1], \tag{3.6}$$

since $g$ is decreasing. Now from (3.6) we easily get $0 < f \leq 1$. Fix such a $f$. Obviously from Holder's inequality $f^q \leq A$. We search now for the minimum and maximum values of $A$ for which there exist $g : [0,1] \to \mathbb{R}^+$ decreasing such that (3.3) and (3.5) hold.

We have the following simple

**Lemma 3.1** *If $g$ satisfies (3.3) and (3.6) then $A \leq \Gamma f^{p-q/p-1}$ where $\Gamma = \left(\frac{p-1}{p}\right)^q \frac{p}{p-q}$.*

**Proof.** It is easy to see that the function which gives the maximum value of $A$ for which there exists $g$ such that (3.3) and (3.6) hold (for a fixed $f$) is that with the largest possible values.

As a matter of fact if $g$ does not have the largest possible values we can arrange things in such a way to produce a function $g_1$ with the same integral and bigger $L^q$-norm. This is done by increasing $g$ to $g_2$ in suitable sets such that $g_2 \leq \psi$ and decreasing $g$ analogously again in suitable sets.

Then since $1 < q$ we easily get that the $L^q$-norm of $g_2$ is bigger than that of $g_1$.

So we set $g_1 : (0,1] \to \mathbb{R}^+$ such that

$$g_1(t) = \psi(t) = \frac{p-1}{p} t^{-1/p}, \ \ t \in (0,c] \ \text{ for } \ c < 1$$

suitable such that $\int\limits_0^c g_1(t)dt = f$ which is equivalent to

$$\int_0^c \psi(t)dt = f \Leftrightarrow c^{1-\frac{1}{p}} = f \Leftrightarrow c = f^{p/p-1}. \tag{3.7}$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned}\int_0^1 g_1^q(t)dt &= \left(\frac{p-1}{p}\right)^q \int_0^c t^{-q/p}dt \\ &= \left(\frac{p-1}{p}\right)^q \frac{1}{1-\frac{q}{p}} c^{1-\frac{q}{p}} = \mathit{\Gamma} f^{p-q/p-1}.\end{aligned}$$

After the comments and the calculations we get the proof of the Lemma. $\square$

In a similar way for a fixed $0 < f \le 1$ we need to find the smallest value of $A$ for which there exist $g$ such that (3.3) and (3.6) hold.

This is done in the following steps

**Lemma 3.2** *If* $0 < f \le 1$ *and* $g : [0,1] \to \mathbb{R}^+$ *such that* $g$ *is decreasing,* $g \le \psi$ $\int\limits_0^1 g(t)dt = f$ *and* $\int\limits_0^1 g^q(t)dt = A$ *then* $A \ge A_f$ *where*

$$A_f = \begin{cases} f^q, & \text{if} \;\; 0 < f \le \frac{p-1}{p} \\ \left(\frac{p-1}{p}\right)^q \frac{1}{p-q}\Big\{p - q[p(1-f)]^{p-q/p-1}\Big\}, & \text{if} \;\; \frac{p-1}{p} < f \le 1. \end{cases}$$

**Proof.** Indeed since $f^q \le A$ for every $f \le 1$ we need only to check the case $\frac{p-1}{p} < f \le 1$. $\Big($Notice that for $A_1 = f^q$ and $g$ such that $g(t) = f$, for every $t \in [0,1]$ we have that $g \le \psi$, $\int\limits_0^1 g(t)dt = f$ and $\int\limits_0^1 g^q(t)dt = A_1$ in case where $0 < f \le \frac{p-1}{p}\Big)$. As before we need to find that $g : [0,1] \to \mathbb{R}^+$ with the smallest values such that $\int\limits_0^1 g(t)dt = f$ and $g \le \psi$. Arguing as before, we consider the function $g_2 : [0,1] \to \mathbb{R}^+$ defined by:

$$\begin{aligned} g_2(t) &= \frac{p-1}{p} c^{-1/p}, \quad t \in (0,c] \\ &= \frac{p-1}{p} t^{-1/p}, \quad t \in [c,1] \end{aligned}$$

where $c$ is such that

$$\int_0^1 g_2(t)dt = f. \tag{3.8}$$

(3.8) now give $\frac{p-1}{p}c^{1-\frac{1}{p}} + \int\limits_c^1 \psi(t)dt = f \Rightarrow \frac{p-1}{p}c^{1-\frac{1}{p}} + \Big(1 - c^{1-\frac{1}{p}}\Big) = f \Rightarrow$ $c^{1-\frac{1}{p}} = p(1-f) \Rightarrow c = \Big[p(1-f)\Big]^{p/p-1}$. So we can easily see that

$$\int_0^1 g_1^q(t)dt = \left(\frac{p-1}{p}\right)^q \frac{1}{p-q}\{p - q[p(1-f)]^{p-q/p-1}\}$$

so the lemma is proved. $\square$

So we proved that for every $f, A$ such that there exists a $g : [0,1] \to \mathbb{R}^+$ with $\int\limits_0^1 g = f$, $\int\limits_0^1 g^q = A$, $g \leq \psi$ we have that $f \leq 1$ and $A_f \leq A \leq \mathit{\Gamma} f^{p-q/p-1}$.

In fact we adittionally proved that for every $f$ there exist functions $g_1, g_2 \leq \psi$ such that $\int\limits_0^1 g_i = f$ and $\int\limits_0^1 g_1^q(t)dt = \mathit{\Gamma} f^{p-q/p-1}$, $\int\limits_0^1 g_2^q(t)dt = \mathcal{A}_f$.

We use this to prove the following

**Lemma 3.3** *If* $0 < f \leq 1$ *and* $\mathcal{A}_f \leq A \leq \mathit{\Gamma} f^{p-q/p-1}$ *then there exists* $g : [0,1] \to \mathbb{R}^+$ *such that*

$$g \leq \psi, \quad \int_0^1 g(t)dt = f \quad \textit{and} \quad \int_0^1 g^q(t)dt = A.$$

**Proof.** Let $0 < f \leq 1$ and $g_1, g_2$ as before. For every $\ell \in [0,1]$ we define $h_\ell := \ell g_1 + (1-\ell)g_2$. Then $h_\ell \leq \psi$, $\int\limits_0^1 h_\ell = f$ and $h_1 = g_1$, $h_0 = g_2$.

Then we consider the function $T : [0,1] \to \mathbb{R}^+$ defined by $T(\ell) = \int\limits_0^1 h_\ell^q$. It is obvious that $T$ is continuous an $[0,1]$ and that $T(0) = \mathcal{A}_f \leq A \leq T(1) = \mathit{\Gamma} f^{p-q/p-1}$.

As a consequence we have that there exists a $\ell \in [0,1]$ such that $T(\ell) = \int\limits_0^1 h_\ell^q(t)dt = A$. By setting $g = h_\ell$ the lemma is proved. $\square$

**Remark 3.1** *Suppose that* $f, A$ *are such that there exists* $g : [0,1] \to \mathbb{R}^+$ *decreasing with* $\int\limits_0^1 g = f$, $\int\limits_0^1 g^q = A$, $g \le \psi$. *Then since* $(X, \mu)$ *is non-atomic there exists* $\phi : (X, \mu) \to \mathbb{R}^+$ *such that* $\phi^* = g$. *Then obviously*

$$\int_X \phi dt = f, \quad \int_X \phi^q dt = A, \quad \|\phi\|_{p,\infty} \le \frac{p-1}{p}.$$

We collect all the above in the following

**Corollary 3.1** *For* $f$ *and* $A$ *positive constants the following are equivalent*

*(i)* *There exists* $\phi : X \to \mathbb{R}^+$ *measurable such that*

$$\int_X \phi d\mu = f, \quad \int_X \phi^q d\mu = A, \quad \|\phi\|_{p,\infty} \le \frac{p-1}{p}.$$

*(ii)* $0 < f \le 1$ *and* $\mathcal{A}_f \le A \le \mathit{\Gamma} f^{p-q/p-1}$.

*We say then that* $(f, A) \in D$.

Actually using the above arguments it is easy to see that the following is true.

**Corollary 3.2** *For* $f$ *and* $A$ *positive constants with* $A \ne f^q$ *the following are equivalent*

*(i)* *There exists* $\phi : (X, \mu) \to \mathbb{R}^+$ *measurable such that*

$$\int_X \phi d\mu = f, \quad \int_X \phi^q d\mu = A, \quad \|\phi\|_{p,\infty} = \frac{p-1}{p}.$$

*(ii)* $0 < f \le 1$ *and* $\mathcal{A}_f \le A \le \mathit{\Gamma} f^{p-q/p-1}$.

# 4. The extremal problem

Suppose now that $(f, A) \in D$ and $\lambda > 0$.

We remind that

$$B(f, A, \lambda) = \sup\left\{\mu(\{\mathcal{M}\phi \geq \lambda\}) : \phi \geq 0,\ \int_X \phi d\mu = f,\ \int_X \phi^q d\mu = A,\right.$$
$$\left.\|\phi\|_{p,\infty} = \frac{p-1}{p}\right\} \tag{4.1}$$

and

$$B_1(f, A, \lambda) = \sup\left\{\mu(\{\mathcal{M}\phi \geq \lambda\}) : \phi \geq 0,\ \int_X \phi d\mu = f,\ \int_X \phi^q d\mu = A,\right.$$
$$\left.\|\phi\|_{p,\infty} \leq \frac{p-1}{p}\right\} \tag{4.2}$$

Our aim is to find the above functions.

First observe that $B(f, A, \lambda) = B_1(f, A, \lambda) = 1$, for $\lambda < f$ so we can suppose that $\lambda \geq f$.

Obviously

$$B_1(f, A, \lambda) \geq B(f, A, \lambda). \tag{4.3}$$

As we shall see later we have equality in (4.3). We work out (4.2). Let $\phi$ be as in there and $E = \{\mathcal{M}\phi \geq \lambda\}$. Then $E$ is the almost disjoint union of elements of $\mathcal{T}$, $I_j$, $j = 1, 2, \dots$ . Indeed, we just need to consider those $I \in \mathcal{T}$ maximal under the condition $\frac{1}{\mu(I)} \int\limits_I \phi d\mu \geq \lambda$.

For every $j$ we have that

$$\int_{I_j} \phi d\mu \geq \lambda \mu(I_j).$$

Summing (4.4) up to $j$ we get

$$\int_E \phi d\mu \geq \lambda \mu(E). \tag{4.4}$$

We again consider the decreasing rearrangement of $\phi$, let $\phi^* : [0,1] \to \mathbb{R}^+$. In this point we need a fact which is true on every non-atomic finite measure space and can be seen in [1].

Namely that for every $\delta \in [0,1]$

$$\int_0^\delta \phi^*(t)dt = \sup \left\{ \int\limits_K \phi d\mu : \begin{array}{l} K \text{ measurable subset} \\ \text{of } X \text{ such that } \mu(K) = \delta \end{array} \right\}$$

where the supremum is actually attained.

From (4.5) we now get in view of the previous comment for $a = \mu(E)$ that $\int\limits_0^a \phi^*(t)dt \geq \lambda a$, so if we define by

$$T(f, A, \lambda) = \sup \left\{ \alpha \in (0,1] : \begin{array}{l} \exists\, g : [0,1] \to \mathbb{R}^+ \ \text{ decreasing} \\ \text{such that } \int_0^1 g = f,\ \int_0^1 g^q = A,\ g \leq \psi \\ \text{and } \int_0^q g \geq \alpha\lambda \end{array} \right\}$$

we have that

$$B_1(f, A, \lambda) \leq T(f, A, \lambda). \tag{4.5}$$

In fact in relation (4.5) the converse inequality is also true. We state is as a

**Lemma 4.1** *If $a \in (0,1]$ and $g : [0,1] \to \mathbb{R}^+$ such that $g$ is decreasing and*

$$\int_0^a g(t)dt \geq a\lambda,\ \int_0^1 g(t)dt = f,\ \int_0^1 g^q(t)dt = A, \quad g \leq \psi,$$

*then there exists $\phi : (X, \mu) \to \mathbb{R}^+$ measurable with*

$$\int_X \phi d\mu = f,\ \int_X \phi^q d\mu = A,\ \|\phi\|_{p,\infty} \leq \frac{p-1}{p}$$

*with the additional property:*

$$\mu(\{\mathcal{M}\phi \geq \lambda\}) \geq a.$$

**Proof.** Indeed from Lemma 2.2 setting $I = X$ we guarantee the existence of a sequence $(I_j)_j$ of pairwise almost disjoint elements of $\mathcal{T}$ in such a way that

$$\mu(\bigcup_j I_j) = \sum \mu(I_j) = a. \tag{4.6}$$

We consider the measure space $([0,a],\ |\cdot|)$ where $|\cdot|$ is Lebesgue measure. Because of $\int\limits_0^a g(t)dt \geq a\lambda$, applying Lemma 2.1 repeatedly we have as a consequence the existence of a partition $S = \{A_j,\ j = 1,2,\dots\}$ of $[0,a]$, which consists of Lebesgue measurable subsets of $[0,a]$ such that

$$|A_j| = \mu(I_j) \ \text{ and } \ \int_{A_j} g(t)dt \geq \lambda |A_j|. \tag{4.7}$$

For every $j = 1,2,\dots$ let now $g_j = (g/A_j)^*$ defined on $[0,|A_j|]$. Since $(X,\mu)$ is non-atomic and $\mu(I_j) = |A_j|$ we easily see that for every $j$ there exists $\phi_j : I_j \to \mathbb{R}^+$ measurable such that $\phi_j^* = g_j$. Additionally suppose that $g' = (g/(a,1])^*$ and set $Y = X \smallsetminus \cup I_j$. Since $\mu(Y) = 1 - a$ for the same reasons we get a $\phi' : Y \to \mathbb{R}^+$ such that $(\phi')^* = g'$. Then since $I_j$ are pairwise almost disjoint there exists a measurable function $\phi : X \to \mathbb{R}^+$ such that $\phi|_{I_j} = \phi_j$ almost everywhere for every $j$ and $\phi|_Y = \phi'$. Then it is easy to see that

$$\phi^* = g \leq \psi, \quad \int_{I_j} \phi d\mu = \int_{A_j} g d\mu \geq \lambda |A_j| = \lambda \mu(I_j)$$

that is

$$\frac{1}{\mu(I_j)} \int_{I_j} \phi d\mu \geq \lambda \ \text{ for every } \ j = 1,2,\dots\ .$$

So, $\{\mathcal{M}\phi \geq \lambda\} \supseteq \cup I_j$. As a consequence we get $\mu(\{\mathcal{M}\phi \geq \lambda\}) \geq a$ and the lemma is proved. $\square$

Using now Lema 4.1 we see that

$$B(f,A,\lambda) = T(f,A,\lambda). \tag{4.8}$$

In fact we have equality in (4.8) even if we replace the inequality:

$$\int_0^a g(t)dt \geq a\lambda$$

given in the definition of $T(f, A, \lambda)$ by equality, thus getting the function $S(f, A, \lambda)$, we state it as

**Remark 4.1** *$B_1(f, A, \lambda) = S(f, A, \lambda)$ where*

$$S(f, A, \lambda) = \sup \left\{ a \in (0, 1] : \begin{array}{l} \exists\, g : [0, 1] \to \mathbb{R}^+ \textit{ decreasing such that} \\ \\ \int_0^1 g = f,\ \int_0^1 g^q = A,\ g \leq \psi \\ \textit{and } \int_0^a g(t)dt = \alpha\lambda. \end{array} \right\} \qquad \square$$

*This is true because if $g$ is as in the definition of $T(f, A, \lambda)$, then of course $\int\limits_0^a g(t)dt \geq a\lambda$. But then there exists $\beta \geq a$ such that $\int\limits_0^\beta g(t)dt = \beta\lambda$ since $\theta(t)$ is a decreasing function of $t$, where $\theta$ is defined by $\theta : (0, 1] \to \mathbb{R}^+$ with $\theta(t) = \frac{1}{t} \int\limits_0^t g(u)du$ ($g$ is decreasing). But then the remark follows by applying Lemma 4.1 with $\beta$ in place of $a$.* $\square$

We collect all the above as

**Corollary 4.1** *For $(f, A) \in D$, $B_1(f, A, \lambda)$ equals the supremum of all $a \in (0, 1]$ for which there exists $g : [0, 1] \to \mathbb{R}^+$ decreasing and $A_1, A_2 \geq 0$ such that*

$$\int_0^a g = f_1,\ \int_0^a g^q = A_1,\ \int_a^1 g = f_2,\ \int_a^1 g^q = A_2$$

*and $g \leq \psi$ where $A_1 + A_2 = A$, $f_1 = \lambda\alpha$, $f_2 = f - \lambda\alpha$.* $\square$

**Remark 4.2** *Notice that we can ignore the demand that $g$ is decreasing in Corollary 4.1 since we can repeat the proof of Lemma 4.1 without this hypothesis.* $\square$

Using now the techniques of Section 3 we can prove the following generalizations of Corollary 3.1.

**Proposition 4.1** *Let* $\alpha \in (0,1]$ $f_1, A_1$ *positive numbers, were* $f_1 \le \alpha^{1-\frac{1}{p}}$. *Then the following are equivalent*

*(i)* $\exists\, g : [0,\alpha] \to \mathbb{R}^+$ *Lebesgue measurable such that* $g \le \psi$ *on* $[0,a]$ *and*

$$\int_0^\alpha \phi = f_1, \quad \int_0^\alpha \phi_1^q = A_1.$$

*(ii) a) If* $0 < f_1 \le \dfrac{p-1}{p}\alpha^{1-\frac{1}{p}}$ *then* $\dfrac{f_1^q}{\alpha^{q-1}} \le A_1 \le \varGamma f_1^{p-q/p-1}$

*b) If* $\dfrac{p-1}{p}\alpha^{1-\frac{1}{p}} \le f_1 \le \alpha^{1-\frac{1}{p}}$ *then*

$$\varDelta_f(\alpha) \le A_1 \le \varGamma f_1^{\frac{p-q}{p-1}}$$

*where*

$$\varDelta_f(\alpha) = \left(\frac{p-1}{p}\right)^p \frac{1}{p-q}\left\{p\alpha^{1-\frac{q}{p}} - q\left[p\left(\alpha^{1-\frac{1}{p}} - f_1\right)\right]^{p-q/p-1}\right\}. \quad \square$$

**Proposition 4.2** *For* $a \in (0,1]$ *and* $f_2, A_2$ *such that* $f_2 \le 1 - \alpha^{1-\frac{1}{p}}$ *the following are equivalent*

*(i)* $\exists\, g : [a,1] \to \mathbb{R}^+$ *Lebesgue measurable such that*

$$g \le \psi \quad \text{on} \quad [\alpha, 1] \quad \text{and} \quad \int_\alpha^1 g = f_2, \ \int_\alpha^1 g^q = A_2.$$

*(ii) a) If* $f_2 \le (1-\alpha)\dfrac{p-1}{p}$ *then* $\dfrac{f_2^q}{(1-\alpha)^{q-1}} \le A_2 \le E_{f_2}(\alpha)$ *where*

$$E_{f_2}(\alpha) = \varGamma\left[\left(f_2 + \alpha^{1-\frac{1}{p}}\right)^{p-q/p-1} - \alpha^{1-\frac{q}{p}}\right].$$

*b) If* $(1-\alpha)\dfrac{p-1}{p} \le f_2 \le 1-\alpha^{1-\frac{1}{p}}$ *then*

$$\mathit{\Gamma}_{f_2}(\alpha) \le A_2 \le E_{f_g}(\alpha)$$

*where*

$$\mathit{\Gamma}_{f_2}(\alpha) = \left(\frac{p-1}{p}\right)^q c^{-q/p}(c-\alpha) + \mathit{\Gamma}(1-c^{1-\frac{q}{p}})$$

*where* $c$ *satisfies*

$$\frac{1}{p}c^{1-\frac{1}{p}} + \left(1-\frac{1}{p}\right)\alpha c^{-1/p} = 1-f_2. \quad \square \tag{4.9}$$

**Remark 4.3** *Notice that since* $(1-\alpha)\frac{p-1}{p} \le f_2 \le 1-\alpha^{1-\frac{1}{p}}$ *then there exists unique* $c$ *satisfying (4.9).* $\square$

In light now of Corollary 4.1 and Proposition 4.1 for a fixed $\lambda > f$ we define the following functions $T_\lambda, S_\lambda : [0, 1/\lambda^p] \to \mathbb{R}^+$ by

$$T_\lambda(\alpha) = \left\{ \begin{array}{lll} \lambda^\alpha \alpha, & \text{for} & \alpha \le \left[\frac{p-1}{p}\Big/\lambda\right]^p \\ \mathit{\Delta}_f(\alpha), & \text{for} & \left[\frac{p-1}{p}\Big/\lambda^p\right]^p < \alpha \le \frac{1}{\lambda^p}. \end{array} \right\}$$

where $f_1 = \lambda\alpha$ and $S_\lambda(\alpha) = \mathit{\Gamma}(\lambda\alpha)^{p-q/p-1}$.

In light of Proposition 4.2 and Corollary 4.1 we also define $F_\lambda, G_\lambda : [0, f/\lambda] \to \mathbb{R}^+$ for $\alpha$ such that $f-\lambda\alpha \le 1-\alpha^{1-\frac{1}{p}}$.

a) If $0 < f \le \dfrac{p-1}{p}$

$$F_\lambda(\alpha) = \frac{(f-\lambda\alpha)^q}{(1-\alpha)^{q-1}} \quad \text{and} \quad G_\lambda(\alpha) = E_{f_2}(\alpha).$$

b) While if $\frac{p-1}{p} < f \le 1$

$$F_\lambda(\alpha) = \left\{ \begin{array}{lll} \frac{(f-\lambda\alpha)^q}{(1-\alpha)^{q-1}}, & \text{for} & \frac{f-\frac{p-1}{p}}{\lambda-\frac{p-1}{p}} \le \alpha \le \frac{f}{\lambda} \\ \mathit{\Gamma}_{f_2}(\alpha), & \text{for} & \alpha \le \frac{f-\frac{p-1}{p}}{\lambda-\frac{p-1}{p}} \end{array} \right\}$$

and $G_\lambda(\alpha) = E_{f_2}(\alpha)$ where $f_2 = f - \lambda\alpha$.

After giving the definitions of $T_\lambda, S_\lambda, F_\lambda, G_\lambda$ we can rewrite Corollary 4.1 as

**Corollary 4.2** *For $(f, A) \in D$ and $\lambda > f$, $B_1(f, A, \lambda)$ equals to supremum of all $\alpha \in (0, 1]$ such that $\alpha \leq \min\{f/\lambda, 1/\lambda^p\}$ and $f - \lambda\alpha \leq 1 - \alpha^{1-\frac{1}{p}}$ for which there exist $A_1, A_2 \geq 0$ with*

$$\left.\begin{array}{l} T_\lambda(\alpha) \leq A_1 \leq S_\lambda(\alpha) \\ F_\lambda(\alpha) \leq A_2 \leq G_\lambda(\alpha) \end{array}\right\} \quad \text{and} \quad A = A_1 + A_2.$$

**Remark 4.4** *i) After stating Corollary 4.2 it is easy to see, in view of Propositions 4.1 and 4.2, that the supremum in (4.2) is actually maximum.*

*ii) If $\alpha = B_1(f, A, \lambda)$ then obviously $\alpha \leq \frac{f}{\lambda}$, while $\alpha \leq \frac{1}{\lambda^p}$. This is true because by i) there exists $g : [0, 1] \to \mathbb{R}^+$ such that $\int\limits_0^\alpha g = \alpha\lambda$, $g \leq \psi$, $\int\limits_0^1 g = f$, $\int\limits_0^1 g^q = A$. But then, by the first two relations we get easily $\alpha \leq \frac{1}{\lambda^p}$.*

*iii) Notice also that because of Propositions 4.1 and 4.2 $F_\lambda(\beta), G_\lambda(\beta), T_\lambda(\beta), S_\lambda(\beta)$ have geometric interpretations as $L^q$-norms of essentially unique functions on the respective intervals when $\beta \leq \min\left\{\frac{f}{\lambda}, \frac{1}{\lambda^p}\right\}$ and $f - \lambda\beta \leq 1 - \beta^{1-\frac{1}{p}}$.*

We state now the following

**Lemma 4.2** *For $(f, A) \in D$ such that $\mathcal{A}_f \lneq A$ and $\alpha(\lambda) = B_1(f, A, \lambda)$, there exists $\lambda_1 \geq \left(\frac{1}{f}\right)^{1/p-1}$ such that $\alpha(\lambda) = \frac{1}{\lambda^p}$, for every $\lambda \geq \lambda_1$.*

**Proof.** If $\lambda \geq \left(\frac{1}{f}\right)^{1/p-1}$ then $\frac{1}{\lambda^p} \leq \frac{f}{\lambda}$.

We consider the equation

$$F_\lambda(1/\lambda^p) = A - \frac{\Gamma}{\lambda^{p-q}}.$$

We easily see that

$$\lim_{\lambda\to\infty} F_\lambda(1/\lambda^p) = \mathcal{A}_f \nleq A = \lim_{\lambda\to+\infty}\left(A - \frac{\Gamma}{\lambda^{p-q}}\right).$$

For $\lambda = \lambda_0 = \left(\frac{1}{f}\right)^{1/p-1}$ we have that

$$F_{\lambda_0}(1/\lambda_0^p) = F_{\lambda_0}\left(\frac{f}{\lambda_0}\right) = 0 \geq A - \Gamma f^{p-q/p-1} = A - \frac{\Gamma}{\lambda_0^{p-q}}.$$

So, there exists $\lambda \geq \lambda_0$ such that

$$F_\lambda(1/\lambda^p) = A - \frac{\Gamma}{\lambda^{p-q}}.$$

Let

$$\lambda_1 = \inf\left\{\lambda \geq \lambda_0 : F_\lambda(1/\lambda^p) = A - \frac{\Gamma}{\lambda^{p-q}}\right\}$$

which is obviously a minimum. Then

$$F_{\lambda_1}\left(\frac{1}{\lambda_1^p}\right) = A - \frac{\Gamma}{\lambda_1^{p-q}}. \tag{4.10}$$

Consider the following function defined on $[0, 1/\lambda_1^p]$: $g_1(t) = \psi(t)$, $0 \leq t \leq 1/\lambda_1^p$. Applying Proposition 4.2 for $\alpha = \frac{1}{\lambda_1^p}$, $f_2 = f - \frac{1}{\lambda_1^{p-1}}$ we obtain that there exists $g_2 : \left[\frac{1}{\lambda_1^p}, 1\right] \to \mathbb{R}^+$ such that

$$g_2 \leq \psi \Big/ \left[\tfrac{1}{\lambda_1^p}, 1\right], \ \int_{1/\lambda_1^p}^1 g_2 = f - \frac{1}{\lambda_1^{p-1}}, \ \int_{1/\lambda_1^p}^1 g_2^q = F_{\lambda_1}\left(\frac{1}{\lambda_1^p}\right).$$

But then if $g : [0,1] \to \mathbb{R}^+$ with $g\Big/\left[0, \tfrac{1}{\lambda_1^p}\right] = \psi$ and $g\Big/\left[\tfrac{1}{\lambda_1^p}, 1\right] = g_2$ we have because of (4.8) that

$$\int_0^1 g_1 = f, \ \int_0^1 g^q = A, \ g \leq \psi, \ \int_0^{1/\lambda_1^p} g = \frac{1}{\lambda_1^{p-1}} = \frac{1}{\lambda_1^p} \cdot \lambda_1$$

and according to Lemma 4.1 we have that $\alpha(\lambda_1) = B_1(f, A, \lambda_1) \geq \frac{1}{\lambda_1^p}$. But of course $\alpha(\lambda_1) \leq \frac{1}{\lambda_1^p}$, so that $\alpha(\lambda_1) = \frac{1}{\lambda_1^p}$. But then we easily see that $\alpha(\lambda) = \frac{1}{\lambda^p}$ for every $\lambda \geq \lambda_1$. This is true because $g : [0,1] \to \mathbb{R}^+$ as mentioned before satisfies:

$$g \leq \psi, \ \int_0^{1/\lambda^p} g = \frac{1}{\lambda^{p-1}} = \frac{1}{\lambda^p} \cdot \lambda \tag{4.11}$$

$\int_0^1 g = f$, $\int_0^1 g^q = A$.

Applying now Lemma 4.1 we obtain the result, that is $\alpha(\lambda) = \frac{1}{\lambda^p}\ \forall\ \lambda \geq \lambda_1$.

$\square$

Let now $\lambda_2 = \min\left\{\lambda : \alpha(\lambda) = \frac{1}{\lambda^p}\right\}$ and $\lambda$ such that $\lambda : \alpha(\lambda) = \frac{1}{\lambda^p}$. Then $\frac{1}{\lambda^p} \leq \frac{f}{\lambda} \Rightarrow \lambda \geq \left(\frac{1}{f}\right)^{1/p-1} = \lambda_0$, so that $\lambda_2 = \min\left\{\lambda \geq \lambda_0 : \alpha(\lambda) = \frac{1}{\lambda^p}\right\}$.

Let $\lambda_1$ as defined in Lemma 4.2. Obviously $\lambda_1 \geq \lambda_2$. We state now the following

**Lemma 4.3** *If $(f, A) \in D$ and $\lambda > f$ such that $\alpha = \alpha(\lambda) = B_1(f, A, \lambda) \not\leq \frac{1}{\lambda^p}$ then there exists $g : [0,1] \to \mathbb{R}^+$ such that $g \leq \psi$, $\int_0^\alpha g = \alpha\lambda$, $\int_0^1 g = f$, $\int_0^1 g^q = A$ and $\int_\alpha^1 g^q = A_2$ where $A_2 = F_\lambda(\alpha)$.*

**Proof.** The existence of such $\alpha$ $g$ is guaranteeted but with $A_2$ such that $F_\lambda(\alpha) \leq A_2 \leq G_\lambda(\alpha)$.

Suppose that $A_2 > F_\lambda(\alpha)$. Then for a suitable $\varepsilon > 0$ which will be chosen later there is a $g_1 : [0,1] \to \mathbb{R}^2$ such that $g_1 \leq \psi$, $\int_0^1 g_1 = f$, $\int_\alpha^1 g_1^q = A_2 - \varepsilon \geq F_\lambda(\alpha)$ and $g_1 = g$ on $[0, \alpha]$. This is true because of Proposition 4.2. Since now $\alpha(\lambda) < \frac{1}{\lambda^p}$ then $g_1 \not\leq \psi$ on a subset of $\left[0, \frac{1}{\lambda^p}\right]$ with positive measure, that is there is space between $g$ and $\psi$ on $\left[0, \frac{1}{\lambda^p}\right]$. Indeed if $g_1 = \psi$ on $\left[0, \frac{1}{\lambda^p}\right]$ then we would have that $\int_0^{1/\lambda^p} g_1 = \int_0^{1/\lambda^p} \psi = \frac{1}{\lambda^p} \cdot \lambda$ and so Lemma 4.1 would give $\alpha(\lambda) = \frac{1}{\lambda^p}$ which is contradiction by assumption. So that

$$\left|\{g_1 \not\leq \psi\} \cap \left[0, \frac{1}{\lambda^p}\right]\right| > 0.$$

So, since $q > 1$ we can increase $g_1$ to $g_2$ on $[0, 1/\lambda^p]$ and decrease $g_1$ to $g_2$ on $[1/\lambda^p, 1]$ in a way that $\int_0^1 g_2 = f$, $\int_0^1 g_2^q > \int_0^1 g_1^q = A - \varepsilon$ such that there exists $\beta > \alpha$ so that $\int_0^\beta g_2 \geq \beta\lambda$. Actually, if $\varepsilon > 0$ is small enough we can arrange everything so that $\int\limits_0^1 g_2^q = A$. This gives $B(f, A, \lambda) > \alpha$ which is a contradiction. So the lemma is proved. $\square$

Now, let $\lambda_2$ be as before. Since $\lambda_2$ is the minimum positive $\lambda$ such that $\alpha(\lambda) = 1/\lambda^p$, we have from Lemma 4.3 and by continuouty reasons that there exists $g : [0, 1] \to \mathbb{R}^+$ such that

$$\int_0^{1/\lambda_2^p} g = \frac{1}{\lambda_2^{p-1}} = \frac{1}{\lambda_2^p} \cdot \lambda_2, \; \int_0^1 g = f, \; \int\limits_0^1 g^q = A, \; g \le \psi$$

and such that

$$A_2 = \int_{1/\lambda_2^p}^1 g^q = F_{\lambda_2}(\alpha)$$

where $\alpha = \alpha(\lambda_2) = \frac{1}{\lambda_2^p}$. But then

$$T_{\lambda_2}(\alpha(\lambda_2)) = S_{\lambda_2}(\alpha(\lambda_2)) = \frac{\mathit{\Gamma}}{\lambda_2^{p-q}}.$$

Since

$$T_{\lambda_2}(\alpha) \le A_1 = \int_0^{1/\lambda_2^p} g \le S_{\lambda_2}(\alpha)$$

we have that

$$F_{\lambda_2}\left(\frac{1}{\lambda_2^p}\right) + \frac{\mathit{\Gamma}}{\lambda_2^{p-q}} = A$$

that is $\lambda_1 = \lambda_2$.

Let now $\lambda = \lambda_1 = \lambda_2$.

Then

$$F_\lambda(1/\lambda^p) + \frac{\mathit{\Gamma}}{\lambda^{p-q}} = A,$$

and $\lambda \ge \left(\frac{1}{f}\right)^{1/p-1}$. For $\mu > \lambda$ and $\beta = \frac{1}{\mu^p}$ we have that

$$\frac{1}{\mu^p} \le \frac{f}{\mu} \quad \text{and} \quad f - \mu\beta \le 1 - \beta^{1-\frac{1}{p}}.$$

Then $F_\mu(\beta) = F_\mu(1/\mu^p)$ describes the minimum $L^q$-norm value of functions $g$ defined on

$$\left[\frac{1}{\mu^p}, 1\right] = [\beta, 1] \text{ for which } \int_\beta^1 g = f - \mu\beta.$$

So

$$F_\mu\left(\frac{1}{\mu^p}\right) + \frac{\Gamma}{\mu^{p-q}} = \int_0^1 g_\mu^q$$

where $g_\mu$ is defined such that

$$g_\mu := \psi, [0, \beta], \quad \int_\beta^1 g_\mu^q = F_\mu\left(\frac{1}{\mu^p}\right) \text{ and } g_\mu \le \psi.$$

But then it is easy to see because of the form of $g_\mu$ that $\int\limits_0^1 g_\mu^q$ decreases when $\mu$ increases.

So that for every $\mu > \lambda$ $F_\mu\left(\frac{1}{\mu^p}\right) + \frac{\Gamma}{\mu^{p-q}} < A$.

Summarizing all the above we obtain the following

**Theorem 4.1** *If $\alpha = B_1(f, A, \lambda)$ where $(f, A) \in D$ with $\mathcal{A}_f \nleq A$, then*

*(i) $\alpha(\lambda) = \dfrac{1}{\lambda^p}$ for every $\lambda \ge \lambda_1$, where $\lambda_1$ is the unique root of the equation*

$$F_\lambda\left(\frac{1}{\lambda^p}\right) + \frac{\Gamma}{\lambda^{p-q}} = A \quad \textit{on the interval} \quad \left(\left(\frac{1}{f}\right)^{1/p-1}, +\infty\right).$$

*(ii) For every $f < \lambda < \lambda_1$ $\alpha$ equals the supremum of all $\beta$ such that $\beta \le \min\left(\frac{f}{\lambda}, \frac{1}{\lambda^p}\right)$ and $f - \lambda\beta \le 1 - \beta^{1-1/p}$ for which*

$$T_\lambda(\beta) \le A - F_\lambda(\beta) \le S_\lambda(\beta). \quad \square$$

We now analyze part (ii) of Theorem 4.1.

Let $f < \lambda < \lambda_1$, so that $\alpha = \alpha(\lambda) = B_1(f, \alpha, \lambda) < \frac{1}{\lambda^p}$. Of course, we must also have that $\alpha \le \frac{f}{\lambda}$. We search now for those $\beta \in \left[0, \frac{1}{\lambda^p}\right]$ such that $f - \lambda\beta \le 1 - \beta^{1-1/p}$.

Consider $K$ defined on $\left[0, \frac{1}{\lambda^p}\right]$ by $K(\beta) = f - 1 + \beta^{1-q/p} - \lambda\beta$. Since $K'(\beta) = \frac{p-1}{p}\beta^{-1/p} - \lambda$, $K$ increasing on $[0, \beta_0]$, decreasing on $\left[\beta_0, \frac{1}{\lambda^p}\right]$ with maximum value at the point $\beta_0$ where $\beta_0 = \left[\frac{p-1/p}{\lambda}\right]^p$. Then

$$K(\beta_0) = f - 1 + \left[\frac{p - 1/p}{\lambda}\right]^{p-1} \cdot \frac{1}{p}$$

which may be positive as well as negative. We first work in case that $K(\beta_0) > 0$ and $\frac{p-1}{p} < f \leq 1$. From the above we have that there exist $\beta_1, \beta_2 \leq \frac{1}{\lambda^p}$ with $\beta_1 < \beta_2$ so that $f - \lambda\beta_i = 1 - \beta_i^{1-\frac{1}{p}}$ for $i = 1, 2$ and for $\beta \leq \frac{1}{\lambda^p}$ we have that $f - \lambda\beta \leq 1 - \beta^{1-\frac{1}{p}}$ if and only if $\beta \in [0, \beta_1] \cup \left[\beta_2, \frac{1}{\lambda^p}\right]$. With the above hypothesis we prove the following

**Lemma 4.4** *For* $(f, A)$ *such that* $A > \mathcal{A}_f$, $f < \lambda < \lambda_1$ *we have that*

$$\alpha = B_1(f, A, \lambda) \in \left[\beta_2, \min\left\{\frac{f}{\lambda}, \frac{1}{\lambda^p}\right\}\right].$$

**Proof.** Obviously, for $\gamma = \frac{f}{\lambda}$, $f - \gamma\lambda \leq 1 - \gamma^{1-\frac{1}{p}}$ and $\lambda\beta_2 \leq \beta_2^{1-\frac{1}{p}}$ so by means of Proposition 4.1 there exists $\phi : [0, \beta_2] \to \mathbb{R}^+$ such that

$$\int_0^{\beta_2} \phi = \lambda\beta_2, \ \phi \leq \psi, \ \int_0^{\beta_2} \phi^q = T_\lambda(\beta_2).$$

Now since $\beta_2 > \beta_0 = \left[\frac{p-1/p}{\lambda}\right]^p$, $T_\lambda(\beta_2) = \varDelta_f(\beta_2)$. We extend now $\phi$ on $[0, 1]$ by defining $\phi = \psi$ on $[\beta_2, 1]$. Then since $f - \lambda\beta_2 = 1 - \beta_2^{1-\frac{1}{p}}$ we have that $\int_0^1 \phi = f$.

By definition now of $\phi$ and $\varDelta_f(\beta_2)$ the form of $\phi$ must be such that $\int_0^1 \phi^q = \mathcal{A}_f$ (since $\int_0^1 \phi = f$). But we remind that $\int_0^{\beta_2} \phi = \lambda\beta_2$. Then, since $\int_0^1 \phi^q = \mathcal{A}_f < A$ it is easy to construct a function $g : [0, 1] \to \mathbb{R}^+$ such that

$g \leq \psi$, $\int\limits_0^1 g = f$, $\int\limits_0^1 g^q = A$ which for a $\gamma$ with $\gamma > \beta_2$ satisfies $\int\limits_0^\gamma g = \gamma\lambda$. But then, applying Lemma 4.1 $B_1(f, A, \lambda) \geq \gamma > \beta_2$ or $\alpha \in \left[\beta_2; \min\left\{\frac{f}{\lambda}, \frac{1}{\lambda^p}\right\}\right]$ that is, what we needed to prove. $\square$

Consider now the following function defined on

$$R_\lambda : \mathit{\Delta} = \left[\beta_2, \min\left\{\frac{f}{\lambda}, \frac{1}{\lambda^p}\right\}\right] \to \mathbb{R}^+$$

with $R_\lambda(\beta) = F_\lambda(\beta) + S_\lambda(\beta)$, $\beta \in \mathit{\Delta}$.

Because of the definitions of $F_\lambda$ and $S_\lambda$ and having in mind the geometric interpretations of them, we easily see that $R_\lambda$ is increasing on $\mathit{\Delta}$. In fact $S_\lambda(\alpha)$ represents the $L^q$-norm of a function $g_1$ defined on $[0, \alpha]$ such that $\int\limits_0^\alpha g_1 = \alpha\lambda$ and $g_1 = \begin{cases} \psi, & \text{on} \quad [0, c] \\ 0, & \text{on} \quad (c, \alpha] \end{cases}$ for suitable $c$. But $F_\lambda(\alpha)$ represents the minimum $L^q$-norm of all functions $\phi$ defined on $[\alpha, 1]$ such that $\int\limits_\alpha^1 \phi = f - \lambda\alpha$. Then there exists essentially unique $g_2 : [\alpha, 1] \to \mathbb{R}^+$ such that $\int\limits_\alpha^1 g_2 = f - \lambda\alpha$ and $F_\lambda(\alpha) = \int\limits_0^1 g_2^q$. We set $g = \begin{cases} g_1, & \text{on} \quad [0, \alpha] \\ g_2, & \text{on} \quad (\alpha, 1] \end{cases}$.

Increasing now $\alpha$, it is obvious that we increase $\int\limits_0^1 g^q$, that is $R_\lambda(\alpha)$ increases.

Let now $\alpha = B_1(f, A, \lambda)$ then as we mentioned before, $\alpha \in \mathit{\Delta}$, and of course $T_\lambda(\alpha) \leq A - F_\lambda(\alpha) \leq S_\lambda(\alpha)$ because of Lemma 4.3. If $\alpha < \min\left\{\frac{f}{\lambda}, \frac{1}{\lambda^p}\right\}$ and $F_\lambda(\alpha) + T_\lambda(\alpha) < A$ then since $f - \lambda\alpha < 1 - \alpha^{1-\frac{1}{p}}$ there exists $\gamma$ such that $\alpha < \gamma < \min\left\{\frac{f}{\lambda}, \frac{1}{\lambda^p}\right\}$ such that $F_\lambda(\gamma) + T_\lambda(\gamma) < \mathcal{A}$ and of course

$$R_\lambda(\gamma) = F_\lambda(\gamma) + S_\lambda(\gamma) \geq A \quad (R_\lambda \text{ is increasing}).$$

That is

$$T_\lambda(\gamma) \leq A - F_\lambda(\gamma) \leq S_\lambda(\gamma).$$

Then Corollary 4.2 gives $B_1(f, A, \lambda) \geq \gamma > \alpha$, a contradiction that is if $\alpha = B(f, A, \lambda) < \min\left\{\frac{f}{\lambda}, \frac{1}{\lambda^p}\right\}$ we must have that $F_\lambda(\alpha) + T_\lambda(\alpha) = A$.

Consider now $\lambda_0 = \left(\frac{1}{f}\right)^{1/p-1}$ and the function $h : E = \left[f, \left(\frac{1}{f}\right)^{1/p-1}\right] \to \mathbb{R}^+$ defined by $h(\lambda) = T_\lambda(f/\lambda)$. Notice that for $f \leq \lambda \leq \left(\frac{1}{f}\right)^{1/p-1}$ we have that $\frac{f}{\lambda} \leq \frac{1}{\lambda^p}$, so this definition makes sense.

Then

$$h(f) = T_f(1) = \mathcal{A}_f \not\leq A \ \text{ and } \ h(\lambda_0) = \varGamma \frac{1}{\lambda_0^{p-q}} = \varGamma f^{p-q/p-1} \geq A.$$

Again, having in mind the geometric interpretation of $T_\lambda(\alpha)$ it is easy to see that $h$ is strictly increasing on $E$. So there exists unique $\lambda_3 \in E$ such that $T_{\lambda_3}(f/\lambda_3) = A$. Now for $f < \lambda \leq \lambda_3$

$$T_\lambda(f/\lambda) \leq A = A - F_\lambda(f/\lambda) \leq \varGamma f^{p-q/p-1} = S_\lambda(f/\lambda)$$

that is in view of Corollary 4.2 $B_1(f, A, \lambda) = \frac{f}{\lambda}$.

For $\lambda_3 < \lambda < \lambda_1$ we obviously have that

$$B(f, A, \lambda) = \max\{\alpha \in \varDelta : F_\lambda(\alpha) + T_\lambda(\alpha) = A\}.$$

So we found $B_1(f, A, \lambda)$ in case that $f < \lambda < \lambda_1$ and $K(\beta_0) > 0$, $\frac{p-1}{p} < f \leq 1$.

The case $K(\beta_0) = 0$ is worked out in the same way where we replace $\beta_2$ by $\beta_0$, while the case $K(\beta_0) < 0$ is worked out for

$$\varDelta = \left[0, \min\left\{\frac{f}{\lambda}, \frac{1}{\lambda^p}\right\}\right].$$

Analogous results are obtained when $0 < f \leq \frac{p-1}{p}$ where

$$\varDelta = \left[0, \min\left\{\frac{f}{\lambda}, \frac{1}{\lambda^p}\right\}\right],$$

since then

$$f - \lambda\beta \leq \frac{p-1}{p}(1-\beta) \leq 1 - \beta^{1-\frac{1}{p}} \ \text{ for every } \ \beta \leq \frac{1}{\lambda^p}.$$

We state all the above results in the following

**Theorem 4.2** *If $(f, A) \in D$, $A \not\leq A_f$ then $B_1(f, A, \lambda)$ is given by*

$$B_1(f, A, \lambda) = \begin{cases} 1, & 0 < \lambda \leq f \\ \frac{f}{\lambda}, & f < \lambda \leq \lambda_3 \\ \delta, & \lambda_3 < \lambda \leq \lambda_1 \\ \frac{1}{\lambda^p}, & \lambda_1 \leq \lambda \end{cases}$$

*where*

$$\delta = \max\{\gamma \in \varDelta : F_\lambda(\gamma) + T_\lambda(\gamma) = A\}. \quad \square$$

That is we found sharp inequalities concerning the localized distribution function of $\mathcal{M}\phi$ given the $L^1$ and $L^q$-norms and the usual quasi-norm $\|\cdot\|_{p,\infty}$ of $\phi$ for $1 < q < p$ as variables.

**Remark 4.5** *i) The case where $A = \mathcal{A}_f$ can be worked out separately because there exists essentially unique function $g : [0, 1] \to \mathbb{R}^+$ such that $\int\limits_0^1 g = f$, $\int\limits_0^1 g^q = A$, $g \leq \psi$.*

*ii) We have that $B(f, A, \lambda) = B_1(f, A, \lambda)$, for $A \neq f^q$ as mentioned in the beginning of this section. This is true of course for $\lambda \geq \lambda_1$, that is for $\lambda$ such that $\alpha(\lambda) = B_1(f, A, \lambda) = \frac{1}{\lambda^p}$.*

*Now for $\lambda < \lambda_1$ let $\alpha = B_1(f, A, \lambda)$. Then there exists $g : [0, 1] \to \mathbb{R}^+$ such that $\int\limits_0^1 g = f$, $\int\limits_0^1 g^q = A$, $\int\limits_0^\alpha g = \alpha\lambda$, $g \leq \psi$. Then it is easy to see that for every $\varepsilon > 0$ small enough we can change $g$ to $g_\varepsilon$ in a way that*

$$\int_0^{\alpha-\varepsilon} g_\varepsilon \geq (\alpha - \varepsilon)\lambda, \quad \int_0^1 g_\varepsilon = f, \quad \int_0^1 g_\varepsilon^q = A + \delta_\varepsilon, \quad \|g_\varepsilon\|_{p,\infty} = \frac{p-1}{p}$$

*and $\delta_\varepsilon \to 0$ as $\varepsilon \to 0^+$. This using continuity arguments gives $B(f, A, \lambda) = \alpha$.*

*iii) In the statement of Theorem 4.2 it is not difficult to see (by doing some tedious calculations in any case according to the way that $F_\lambda$, $T_\lambda$ are defined) that for the range $\lambda_3 < \lambda < \lambda_1$ there is in fact unique $\gamma \in \varDelta$ such that $F_\lambda(\gamma) + T_\lambda(\gamma) = A$, because $F_\lambda + T_\lambda$ is increasing on $\varDelta$.*

*iv) Notice the continuity of the function as calculated on Theorem 4.2, at the point $\lambda = \lambda_1$. As a matter of fact $\delta$ is such that $F_{\lambda_1}(\delta) + T_{\lambda_1}(\delta) = A$. But $\lambda_1$ is such that*

$$F_{\lambda_1}\left(\frac{1}{\lambda_1^p}\right) + \frac{\mathit{\Gamma}}{\lambda_1^{p-q}} = A, \quad \textit{and} \quad \frac{\mathit{\Gamma}}{\lambda_1^{p-q}} = S_{\lambda_1}\left(\frac{1}{\lambda_1^p}\right) = T_{\lambda_1}\left(\frac{1}{\lambda_1^p}\right).$$

*So that*

$$F_{\lambda_1}(\delta) + T_{\lambda_1}(\delta) = F_{\lambda_1}\left(\frac{1}{\lambda_1^p}\right) + T_{\lambda_1}\left(\frac{1}{\lambda_1^p}\right) = A,$$

*which in view of Remark iii) above, gives $\delta = \frac{1}{\lambda_1^p}$.* □

We state now the following immediate corollary of Theorem 4.2 as

**Theorem 4.3** *For $(f, A) \in D$, $\lambda > f$, $F = \frac{p-1}{p}$ and $A \gneqq \mathcal{A}_f$ the following holds:*

$$\sup\left\{\|\mathcal{M}\phi\|_{p,\infty} : \phi \geq 0,\ \int_X \phi d\mu = f,\ \int_X \phi^q d\mu = A,\ \|\phi\|_{p,\infty} = F\right\} = \frac{p}{p-1}F$$

*with the supremum attained.*

*That is (1.7) is best possible allowing every value of the $L^1$ and $L^q$-norm.* □

# References

[1] C. Bennet, R. Sharpley, Interspolation of Operators Academic Press.

[2] D. L. Burkholder, Martingales and Fourier Analysis in Banach spaces, C.I.M.E. Lectures (Varenna (Como), Italy, 1985), Lecture Notes in Mathematics 1206(1986), 61-108.

[3] D. L. Burkholder, Boundary value problems and sharp inequalities for martingale transforms, Ann. of Prob. 12(1984), 647-702.

[4] L. Grafakos, Classical and Modern Fourier Analysis, Pearson Education, Upper Saddle River, NI, 2004.

[5] A. D. Melas, The Bellman functions of dyadic-like maximal operators and related inequalities, Adv. Math. 192(2005) 310-340.

[6] A. D. Melas, E. Nikolidakis, Dyadic-like maximal operators on integrable functions and Bellman functions related to Kolmogorov's inequality, Transactions of the American Mathematical Society, vol. 362, No 3, March 2010, papes: 1571-1596.

[7] A. D. Melas, E. Nikolidakis, On weak type inequalities for dyadic maximal functions, J. Math. Anal, Appl. (2008) 404-410.

[8] E. N. Nikolidakis, Extremal problems related to maximal dyadic-like operators, J. Math. Anal. Appl. 369(2010) 377-385.

[9] G. Wang, Sharp maximal inequalities for conditionally symmetric martingales and Brownian motion, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. 112(1991) 579-586.